## **BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION/Employee Stock Ownership Plans**

SUBJECT: Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995 . . . S. 1357. Domenici motion to table the Simon/Stevens/Breaux amendment No. 3035.

## **ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 56-42**

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1357, the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, will result in a balanced budget in seven years, as scored by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). The bill will also provide a \$245 billion middle-class tax cut, \$141.4 billion of which will be to provide a \$500 per child tax credit.

The Simon/Stevens/Breaux amendment would delay for 2 years the repeal of the 50-percent interest exclusion given to banks for the interest they earn on loans they give for the establishment of employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs).

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of debate was permitted, and some statements were inserted in the record. Following debate, Senator Domenici moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

## Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The amendment would lose \$500 million over 7 years by keeping open for 2 more years this corporate welfare loophole. This loophole is enormous, and should be closed. We therefore oppose this amendment.

## **Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

No hearings have been held on the elimination of section 133, which permits banks to exclude half of their interest income on loans they give to establish ESOPs. If hearings were held, Senators would learn that only 50 ESOPs per year are established on average, and they would also learn that every analysis ever done of them has found that they improve productivity. Even the Chamber

(See other side) **YEAS (56)** NAYS (42) NOT VOTING (1) Republicans Republicans **Democrats** Republicans Democrats Democrats (50 or 96%) (6 or 13%) (2 or 4%) (40 or 87%) **(1)** (0)Abraham Helms Bradley Coats Akaka Kennedy Kassebaum-2 Ashcroft Hutchison Bryan Stevens Baucus Kerrey Inhofe Biden Bennett Dorgan Kerry Jeffords Bond Feingold Bingaman Kohl Brown Kempthorne Johnston Boxer Lautenberg Burns Moynihan Breaux Leahy Kyl Campbell Lott Bumpers Levin Chafee Lieberman Lugar Byrd Conrad Cochran Mack Mikulski McCain Moseley-Braun Cohen Daschle Coverdell McConnell Dodd Murray Murkowski Craig Exon Nunn D'Amato Nickles Feinstein Pell DeWine Pressler Ford Prvor Dole Roth Glenn Reid Domenici Santorum Graham Robb EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: Faircloth Shelby Harkin Rockefeller Frist Simpson Heflin Sarbanes 1—Official Buisiness Gorton Smith Hollings Simon 2—Necessarily Absent Wellstone Gramm Snowe Inouve 3—Illness Grams Specter 4—Other Grassley Thomas Gregg Thompson SYMBOLS: Hatch Thurmond AY—Announced Yea Hatfield Warner AN-Announced Nay PY-Paired Yea PN-Paired Nay

VOTE NO. 551 OCTOBER 27, 1995

of Commerce says that they increase productivity by between 3 percent and 17 percent. Anything that the Senate can do to increase the productivity of American workers should be encouraged, considering global competitive pressures and the steady loss of jobs overseas that has been occurring recently. Further, in these days of soaring corporate profits and stagnant employee wages, we see ESOPs as a way of guaranteeing fairer employee treatment, because when employees themselves own their companies, they are not, to put it mildly, as intent on driving down their own wages during periods of record profitability. In our opinion, the revenue gains from eliminating this rarely used exclusion have been greatly exaggerated, and we are confident that hearings would expose this fact, plus they would convince Senators of the worth of ESOPs. We therefore favor the Simon/Stevens amendment, to give Senators a little more time to consider this exclusion before they do away with it.